



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/057,331	01/24/2002	Andrei Z. Broder	5598/153US	1535

7590 08/04/2006

Seth Ostrow  
BROWN RAYSMAN MILLSTEIN FELDER AND STEINER LLP  
900 Third Avenue  
New York, NY 10022-4728

EXAMINER

HILLERY, NATHAN

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 08/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/057,331	BRODER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nathan Hillery	2176	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Nathan Hillery. (3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Chad Zhong. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 02 August 2006.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Bharat et al..


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
Examiner's signature, if required

## Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

### Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

### Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

#### Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

#### 37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,  
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

### Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: discussed applicant's arguments as laid out in the continuation sheets accompanying the PTOL-413a Form. Explained possible interpretations of Bharat that read on the claims of record based on Applicant's representative's interpretation of the reference. For example, if the text representation of a URL reads on the claimed anchortext and the unique substrings of Bharat read on the claimed tokens, then the fact that Bharat takes the number of unique sub-strings of the URL and determines if they are an exact match to a term in the user's query reads on "for each token: determining a weight for the token, determining whether the weight assigned to the token exceeds a threshold token weight", since the substrings that match are used and those that do not match are not used - whether or not the substring matches is the claimed threshold. The entertainment of such arguments and alternate interpretations sought to further prosecution. It should be noted that the application has been finally rejected and any discussion of "what if's" is not an assertion or admittance that the interpretation on which the final rejections under 35 USC 103(a) were based is in error.

PTOL-413A (09-04)  
Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: 10/057,331 First Named Applicant: Farzin Maghoul  
Examiner: Hillery, Nathan Art Unit: 2176 Status of Application: Final

#### Tentative Participants:

(1) Chad Zhong (2) Nathan Hillery  
(3) \_\_\_\_\_ (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Proposed Date of Interview: 8/2/06 Proposed Time: 1:00 (AM/PM) (PM)

#### Type of Interview Requested:

(1) ☒ Telephonic (2) ☐ Personal (3) ☐ Video Conference

Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ YES ☒ NO

If yes, provide brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

### Issues To Be Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) <u>Rej</u>	<u>clm 1</u>	<u>Sharat et. al.</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(2) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(3) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(4) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

☒ Continuation Sheet Attached

#### Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:

see continuation sheet.

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on 8/2/06.  
**NOTE:** This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

Chad Zhong  
Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature

[Signature]  
Examiner/SPE Signature

Chad Zhong  
Typed/Printed Name of Applicant/Representative

58,270  
Registration Number, if applicable

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.133. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 21 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

Appln. 10/057,331

PATENT  
Attorney Docket No. 5598/153

## Continuation Sheet – Telephone interview agenda

1. Examiner mentions it is obvious to provide for “indexing the document under the token, if the token weight assigned to the token exceeds the threshold token weight.” Office Action, 7/11/2006, p. 3. Applicant would like to see relevant document(s) that discusses such obviousness.

2. It is unclear to the Applicant where “locating a set of documents that include hyperlinks to the document; retrieving anchortext associated with at least one of hyperlinks; parsing the anchortext into one or more tokens” is taught in Bharat. In Bharat, Examiner appears to assert tokens as equivalent with node 212 or page 121. Following this assertion, only the URL or hyperlinks are pointing to node 212 or page 121. Col. 4, lines 50 through 60. Furthermore, Examiner points to unique sub-strings in the URL as the functional equivalent of anchortext. However, upon further review, unique sub-strings are not further parsed into one or more pages.

According to an embodiment of Bharat, a check is made to determine the number of terms of the query that appear as unique sub-strings in the URL of the represented documents. Col. 3, lines 10 through 15. Bharat discusses comparison of the keywords in the query with unique sub-strings of the URL. Col. 5, lines 53 through 55. Bharat further discusses

$\text{Score}(p) = \text{in\_degree} + 2 \times (\text{num\_query\_matches}) + \text{out\_degree}$ , where  $\text{in\_degree}$  is the number of edges pointing at node  $n_p$ ,  $\text{num\_query\_matches}$  is the number of unique sub-strings of the URL of the page  $p$  that exactly match a term in user's query. Col. 5, lines 60 through 65. Bharat, at best, discusses a comparison between terms of a query and

BRMFS1 933275v.1

Appln. 10/057,331

PATENT  
Attorney Docket No. 5598/153

unique sub-strings of the URL of the nodes. Bharat does not parse unique sub-strings of URLs into one or more nodes/pages. Thus, Bharat does not teach "parsing the anchor text into one or more tokens" as recited in claim 1.

3. In claim 1, a document and a token are discussed therein, specifically "indexing the document under the token, if the token weight assigned to the token exceeds the threshold token weight." Bharat discusses documents as pages themselves. Col. 2, lines 65 through Col. 3, lines 5. Furthermore, as discussed herein, it appears the Examiner is relying on pages as tokens. It is unclear how Bharat teaches indexing the page under the page, if the page weight assigned to the page exceeds the threshold page weight. Thus, claim 1 is not anticipated by Bharat reference.

Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested in light of the above comments.

BRMFS1 933275v.1